

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/657,318	09/08/2003	Allen L. Martin	525-006	5280	
26948 75	90 07/21/2005		EXAMINER		
ELLIS & VENABLE, PC			TRIEU, T	TRIEU, THAI BA	
101 NORTH FI	RST AVE.				
SUITE 1875			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
PHOENIX, AZ 85003			3748		

DATE MAILED: 07/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

1	nte

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/657,318	MARTIN, ALLEN L.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Thai-Ba Trieu	3748					
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address					
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period who Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	i6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI	ely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 M	a <u>y 2005</u> .						
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)☐ This	action is non-final.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	ce except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-7,29 and 30</u> is/are pending in the ap	polication.						
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	•						
5)⊠ Claim(s) <u>29 and 30</u> is/are allowed.							
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) 7 is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner	•						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	• •					
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.					
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	-(d) or (f).					
a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents	haya haan rassiyad						
1. Certified copies of the priority documents2. Certified copies of the priority documents		Da No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	, ,						
application from the International Bureau	•	a in the National Stage					
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
Attachment(s)	. 🗖						
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da						
2) ☐ Notice of Draisperson's Patent Drawing Review (P10-948) 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 05/31/2005.		atent Application (PTO-152)					

Art Unit: 3748

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to the Amendment filed on May 06, 2005. Applicant's cooperation in correcting the informalities in the specification is appreciated. Applicant's cooperation in amending the claims to overcome the claim objections relating to informalities as well as indefinite claim language is also appreciated.

Claims 1 and 29 were amended, and claims 8-28 were cancelled.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minato et al. (Patent Number 5,112,281), in view of Heimark (Patent Number 6,082,340).

Minato discloses an external drive assembly, having secondary overdrive components, for use with an impeller of a supercharger comprising:

a multibelt pulley (20,21,22) adapted to receive a drive source (Read as the cam shaft 2 being constructed as to be rotated in association with a crank shaft (not shown)..., See Column 4, lines 24-31);

an impeller pulley (3) drivingly coupled to the impeller;

Art Unit: 3748

an external drive belt (5 and 6) having at least one rib coupled to the multibelt pulley to drive the impeller pulley;

an adjustable idler (30) engagingly connected to the external drive belt;

wherein the impeller pulley (3) and the multibelt pulley (20,21,22) engage with the at least one rib of the external drive belt (5 and 6) (See Figures 1-4).

Minato discloses the invention as recited above; however, fails to disclose a drive source using a motor belt and an internal drive assembly for coupling the impeller pulley to the impeller.

Heimark teaches that it is conventional in the supercharger art, to utilize a drive source using a motor belt (34) and an internal drive assembly (40,42,44,48,50,52) for coupling the impeller pulley to the impeller (See Figures 2-3).

It would has been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at that time the invention was made, to have utilized a drive source using a motor belt and an internal drive assembly for coupling the impeller pulley to the impeller, as taught by Heimark, to improve the performance efficiency of the Minato drive system.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minato et al. (Patent Number 5,112,281), in view of Heimark (Patent Number 6,082,340), and further in view of Kumm (Patent Number 5,176,581).

The modified Minato discloses the invention as recited above; however, fails to disclose the adjustable idler being spring loaded.

Kumm teaches that it is conventional in the belt tensioner art, to utilize a spring loaded idler pulley (10) (See Column 2, lines 35-65).

Art Unit: 3748

It would has been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at that time the invention was made, to have utilized the adjustably spring loaded idler, as taught by Kumm, to provide a constant loading of the belt, in the modified Minato device.

Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Minato et al. (Patent Number 5,112,281), in view of Heimark (Patent Number 6,082,340) and Kumm (Patent Number 5,176,581), and further in view of Fisher (Patent Number 4,028,955).

The modified Minato device discloses the invention as recited above; and further discloses the multibelt pulley engaging at least the external drive belt and a motor belt (5 and 6) (See Manito Figure 2), and adapted to receive a rotatable shaft (2) of an existing engine component (1) (See Figure 2); however, fails to disclose the external drive belt being selected from the group consisting of: serpentine belts, polydrive belts or toothed belts.

Fisher teaches that it is conventional in the belt art, to utilize the serpentine belts, polydrive belts or toothed belts (See Column 5, lines 36-67, and Column 6, lines 1-7).

It would has been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at that time the invention was made, to have utilized the serpentine belts, polydrive belts or toothed belts, as taught by Fisher, to provide a positive guide for the belt in the modified Minato device.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 29-30 are allowed.

Claim 7 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-7 and 29-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

- 1. The Applicant's arguments set forth on Page 8 is persuasive for the amended claim 29; accordingly, the obviousness type double patenting rejection of claim 29 has been withdrawn.
- 2. With regard to the Applicant's argument set forth on Pages 8-9, applicant states that the reference to Minato et al. (Patent Number 5,112,281) does not disclose a supercharger having the external drive mechanism having secondary overdrive components comprising a multi-belt pulley adapted to receive a drive source using a motor belt.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant since:

1. First of all, the recitation of "an external drive assembly, having secondary overdrive components" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not

Art Unit: 3748

accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

- 2. Secondly, the limitation "for use with an impeller of a supercharger" is an intended use recitation. A recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In a claim drawn to process of making, the intended use must result in a manipulative difference as compared to the prior art. See In re Casey, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and In re Otto, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCCPA 1963).
- 3. In response to the applicant's arguments, the limitation of "a drive source using motor belt" is clearly disclosed by Heimark (Patent Number 6,082,340) (See the rejection being set forth above).
- 3. The rejections of claims 2-6 set forth above to respond to the Applicant's arguments stated on Pages 10-11 in the remarks of the Amendment filed on May 06, 2005.

Art Unit: 3748

Conclusion

The IDS (PTO-1449) filed on May 31, 2005 has been considered. An initialized copy is attached hereto.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Cartensen (US Patent Number 5,971,721) discloses a high-pressure pump having a drive motor driving an eccentric transmission.
- La Boda (US Patent Number 5,152,027) discloses an industrial sweeper having a first pulley driving by a motor, a second pulley on a drive shaft for driving the drive wheel, a third pulley for driving the main brush, and a drive belt interconnecting the first and second pulleys which can be selective by a clutch for driving the drive wheel.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Page 8

Application/Control Number: 10/657,318

Art Unit: 3748

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Thai-Ba Trieu whose telephone number is (571) 272-

4867. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Thursday (6:30-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Thomas E. Denion can be reached on (571) 272-4859. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-

872-9306.

Additionally, the new Central FAX Number (571) 273-8300 is effective on July

15, 2005. The old number (703-872-9306) will be routed to the new number until

September 15, 2005.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

TTB

July 19, 2005

Thai-Ba Trieu

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 3748